

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12-16, and 18-27 are in the case. New claim 27 is a rewrite of claim 11, now deleted.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's availability for Interview on July 21, 2005. In that telephonic interview, Examiner Neveen, Mr. Radatti and the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, discussed the applicability of Sowa et. al., U.S. Patent No. 6,594,665 ("Sowa.") to claims 1 to 9, 11 to 16, and 18 - 26.

In the Office Action dated March 23, 2005, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-19, and 21-26 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by Sowa. Claims 4, 14 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sowa in view of Adya et. al. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188605 ("Adya.")

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

At the Interview, the differences between Sowa's teaching of a hash of the file names and the present claims' teaching of a hash of the file contents were discussed.

The Examiner stated that the claims at issue did not clearly define the difference that is, the claims that were under final did not clearly claim that the file contents were the genesis of any given hash value. Applicant agreed to amend the claims to make more clear that it is the file contents that were being hashed, rather than the file name. The Examiner agreed that Sowa does not teach hashing of the file contents – only of the file name, and indicated that therefore, Sowa would not be an invalidating reference.

Applicant therefore presents amended independent claims herein. These amended independent claims are meant to make more clear the nature of a hash value – it is


comprised of a hash of a file's contents. New claim 27 is a rewritten version of now canceled claim 11 with the limitation of a hash value being comprised of a file's contents made more clear.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the limitations of the claims are not met by the Sowa reference, nor by the combination of Sowa and Adya, and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejections be withdrawn and the claims proceed to issue.

Conclusion

Claims 1-9, 12-16, and 18-27 define patentable subject matter over the art of record and are not anticipated by nor obvious in view of the references of record. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dated: July 25, 2005

Joseph E. Chovanes, Esq.  
Registration No. 33,481  
Attorney for Applicant  
Tel.: 610-648-3994  
Fax: 610-648-3997